DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 037 209 JC 700 064

AUTHOR Malik, Joseph A., Ed.; Shay, Thomas M., Ed.
TITLE Workshop in Community College Administration: Proceedings 1968.
INSTITUTION Colorado Univ., Boulder Higher Education Center.
PUB DATE [69]
NOTE 46p.; Report of Selected Topics presented at the Workshop in Community College Administration (Boulder, Colorado, July 22-August 9, 1968)

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.40
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Role, *Junior Colleges, *School Administration, School Community Relationship, State Boards of Education, Student Personnel Services, *Workshops

ABSTRACT

A 3-week workshop provided an overview of many areas that concern junior college administrators. Six of the topics discussed during the workshop include (1) new emphases in administrative and organizational thinking; (2) current status and problems of student personnel services; (3) the extra-institutional obligations of the community college administrator; (4) the role of state boards and the functions of their state officers; (5) roles of community college administrators in building the budget; and (6) developing leadership in the college and the community. (MS)

ED037209

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

WORKSHOP IN COMMUNITY COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION PROCEEDINGS 1968

Edited by
JOSEPH A. MALIK
THOMAS M. SHAY

MOUNTAIN - PLAINS COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEADERSHIP PROGRAM
HIGHER EDUCATION CENTER
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO
BOULDER, COLORADO 80302

JC 700 064

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAR 5 1970

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE
FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Introduction	Joseph A. Malik Thomas M. Shay	1
New Emphases in Administrative and Organizational Thinking	Calvin M. Frazier	2
Current Status and Problems of Student Personnel Services	Joseph A. Malik	9
The Extra-Institutional Obligations of the Community College Administrator	Duane Anderson	16
The Role of State Boards and the Functions of Their State Officers	Paul A. Elsner	25
Roles of Community College Administrators in Building the Budget	Donald Shore	32
Developing Leadership in the College and the Community	William L. Mc Divitt	36
Schedule of Workshop Activities		41
Roster of Participants		43

INTRODUCTION

In February, 1968, the School of Education at the University of Colorado received a grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation to establish the Mountain-Plains Community College Leadership Program. The first formal activity conducted under the auspices of the Community College Leadership Program was a three-week workshop in community college administration held on the University of Colorado campus, July 22 - August 9, 1968. The workshop enrolled thirteen participants representing eight states and Canada.

The purpose of the workshop was to provide participants an over-view of many of the important areas of concern to the community college administrator, and an opportunity to study several of these areas in depth. The workshop included community college visitations so participants could gain perspective on the complexities of administration as well as the diversity of community colleges.

This document is a report of selected topics presented during the three-week workshop. Because the workshop met in a variety of locations, and dealt with administrative problems in several ways, only those activities which lent themselves to a more formal presentation are included here. These papers, do, however, reflect the wide range of issues and problems discussed during the three-week session.

Professor Calvin M. Frazier, formerly Associate Professor of Education at the University of Colorado, introduced the study of administration by discussing a number of theoretical concepts relevant to leadership and organizations. Dr. Joseph Malik examined current research in junior college student personnel services. Dr. Duane Anderson of the University of Iowa pointed out various external forces which can bring pressure to bear upon administrators and then discussed a framework for administrative behavior. Dr. Paul Elsner, Director of the Division of Community Colleges, Colorado State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education, presented a number of trends in the community college movement while giving special attention to state level governance. Mr. Donald Shore, Budget Officer at Mesa College in Grand Junction, Colorado, discussed the process of budget building and identified appropriate administrative roles. The last paper presented here is a talk presented to the workshop participants by President William L. Mc Divitt on the campus of Otero Junior College in La Junta, Colorado. Dr. Mc Divitt, the President at Otero, presented his point of view on leadership in the college and community.

The staff of the Mountain-Plains CCLP wishes to express its appreciation to the participants as well as to the guests who made presentations to the workshop. A special note of thanks is due the staffs of Northeastern Junior College, Sterling, Colorado, Otero Junior College, La Junta, Colorado, and the Community College of Denver for providing the opportunity of visiting their respective campuses.

Joseph A. Malik
Thomas M. Shay

NEW EMPHASES IN ADMINISTRATIVE AND ORGANIZATIONAL THINKING

Calvin M. Frazier*
Associate Professor of Education
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado

In considering the status of leadership in our country today, one is certainly struck by the intensity of the challenges faced by many of our institutional leaders. In education, for instance, anyone trying to cope with the cross-currents of New York City schools could be forgiven for reaching the conclusion that the issues seem almost beyond resolution. But educational organizations do not have a corner on the leadership 'problem' market. There is no doubt that educators are caught in broader societal upheavals that are creating turmoil and conflict for all public administrators.

At the 1968 meeting of the American Association of School Administrators in Atlantic City, Eric Severeid prefaced his assessment of America's problems by pinpointing perhaps the most serious and underlying dilemma of all. He was referring to the paralysis of leadership that he felt he observed all too often in the nation's capital. Not restricting his remarks to an evaluation of leaders in any one party, he expressed concern that national leadership has seemed unable to conceptualize the scope and complexity of our problems, much less demonstrate the capacity to lead the country out of its present unrest. When top-level leaders exhibit such a helplessness, it should not be surprising that lesser leaders in our society find it difficult to counter local manifestations of national frustrations.

In John Gardner's excellent statement, The Antileadership Vaccine, it would seem that the author was quite accurate in attributing at least some of our past and present difficulties to leadership inadequacies. The failure to cope with the big questions, the failure to develop confidence in leaders, and the immunizing of our young people against the temptation to assume leadership positions, are three factors listed by Gardner as contributing to the discouraging state we find outselves in today. For these reasons and others, many would probably support the idea that the best minds in our society have not sought public leadership posts. A vacuum has developed as a result, and many persons of mediocre ability and questionable motivation have sometimes taken the helm of our public institutions.

In the judgment of some, the situation has deteriorated to the point that institutions are being advised to alter accepted organizational patterns and to try functioning without professional administrators. Student activists at the college level claim they can do as well as college administrators in establishing a learning environment having relevance to the current scene. While some would dismiss this cry as being a common one for student groups, the same challenge is being raised by more respected organizations. Teacher associations have proposed that principals and other district leaders should be replaced by individuals selected by the teachers and appointed on a rotating basis. Such proposals, coupled with a growing anxiety over our ability to maintain our society, have stimulated a re-assessment of an administrator's responsibility in a public organization. In the past, we have often confused leadership with efficient management. We have wrongly assumed the development of administrative competence

---

* Dr. Frazier is now Deputy Superintendent of Schools, Colorado Springs, Colo.

through the completion of prescribed academic courses. We are beginning to realize how little we have known about the characteristics of leadership and the means of promoting growth in leadership skills.

In the Neal Gross and R. E. Herriott investigation of elementary principals and their EPL - Executive Professional Leadership, the researchers found little relationship between the amount of formal education experienced by the principal and his leadership contribution to the professional staff. Nor did the length of administrative experience or the opportunity to serve as an assistant principal appear to be important factors in the development of an effective educational leader. In addition to these findings in the book, Staff Leadership in Public Schools: A Sociological Inquiry, some discouraging conclusions tend to emerge from the national study of superintendents by Keith Goldhammer and others, titled, Issues and Problems in Contemporary Educational Administration. District leaders were of a unanimous opinion that their preparatory programs and in-service opportunities were far from adequate for preparing them for their daily round of problems.

The two studies are illustrative of many reports appearing in recent years in regard to educational leadership. The findings seem almost redundant in their emphasis on the gap between administrative training and practice and the leadership weaknesses identified. It would be easy to become disheartened by such reports, except for the fact that these studies and observations by people like Gardner and Severeid appear to have encouraged a counter movement that might eventually lead to a more optimistic and complimentary appraisal of our leaders.

A New Emphasis

Authorities seem generally agreed that we have gone through at least two phases of administrative thinking since the turn of the century. The time divisions are somewhat arbitrary but it would seem that the first era encompassed approximately three decades. Dominated by such men as Frederick Taylor and the emphasis on scientific management, the stress came to fall on efficiency and the technical aspects of leadership. The ideas and studies were business and industry oriented, but there was significant spill-over to education and public administration. By the 1930's, a shift away from this 'Cult of Efficiency' could be discerned.

Developments in the field of psychology and reactions to the impersonalization of the organization generated a closer examination of the individual employee. Management began to look at the aspirations, motives, and attitudes of employees. Encouragement was given to employee participation in decision-making activities, and management training programs came to stress the potential of the committee as a means of achieving involvement. It should be noted that many of the present school leaders came through programs having this human relations thrust.

Despite desirable characteristics of these two periods, concern began to grow in the early 1950's that something was missing. An administrator might be very smooth in his handling of the technical aspects of the organization. He might also have very fine relationships with his staff. But, without adequate attention to the purpose and direction of the organization, a leader could unknowingly inject a serious handicap into the operation. Current writings place a real stress on the value of this conceptualizing contribution and the need for the leader to develop a comprehensive understanding of the processes by which an organization functions, evaluates, and changes. Studies of administrative short-

comings of leaders trained primarily in the human relations and technical skills have served to hasten the onset of this conceptual or process era in management thinking. It is the purpose of this paper to discuss some of the key concepts that seem to be emerging from the literature and to suggest the importance of these ideas to educational administrators.

Some have described this recent shift as being an attempt to use the best from the two previous eras. There is little interest in neglecting the understanding we have gained regarding individual and group behavior in an organizational setting. Nor is there any desire to give less emphasis to the efficient utilization of human and physical resources. The technical and human relations skills are still important but are being viewed in the context of their contribution to the achievement of organizational goals. They are critical to maintaining the organization but proficiency in these areas does not insure any forward movement on the part of the group. Greater stress is now being given to identification of basic principles and assumptions that help to explain organizational phenomena in such a way that an administrator can begin to predict the results of manipulating the existing conditions. This type of theorizing seeks to isolate the 'whys' of administration rather than focusing exclusively on the 'how' aspects. When an administrator attempts to move more to this scientific and theoretical base, he is not undertaking a simple task. Administrative theorizing involves the ordering of philosophical assumptions and scientific principles into some broad generalizations that permit the leader to account for the events of the day and predict future occurrences with some degree of accuracy.

The starting point is philosophical because it involves clarification of one's thinking in respect to the purpose and nature of man. Man must also be studied and understood in a scientific manner in regard to his physiological and psychological make-up. Combining the two insights, one can better understand man's need to relate to other men through group, institutional, and societal involvement. This interaction becomes central to man's well-being and growth. The institution of education represents a most significant collective effort to improve man. Therefore, regardless of the educational sub-unit involved, there is an obligation on the part of the educator to relate the day-to-day activities of the organization to the improvement of man and his society. Curriculum development, budget-making, staff utilization, athletic contests, and class scheduling are not unrelated happenings but are parts of a total system - a system operating with a very specific purpose for members of our society. Integration of these parts becomes a primary task of the administrator.

Some effort has been made by researchers to determine how much attention is given to theorizing and conceptualizing activities by practicing administrators. The results suggest that little time is directed to such ends. Time studies have been made utilizing Katz's classification scheme of three types of administrative tasks: technical, human relations, and conceptual. Most findings indicate that at least ninety percent of an administrator's time is spent in technical and human relations activity. Studies viewed from a somewhat different perspective tend to have a similar outcome. Taking the decision-making categories of appellate, intermediary, and creative as proposed by Darling, investigators have concluded that less than ten percent of a principal's decisions tend to be of a creative type. Most decisions are stimulated by a need to clarify policy to subordinates, or come in response to demands from superiors. Few decisions emerge from the principal's office because of study or reflection on the effectiveness of the organization. Regardless of the viewpoint or terminology, there seems to be ample evidence that few educational leaders are devoting much time and thought to some of the basic issues confronting man and his educational institution.

John Gardner's charge that leaders have failed to cope with the big questions would appear to be well founded.

The Dynamics of an Organization

To successfully integrate the various activities of any educational unit and to achieve certain ends, the leadership must be cognizant of the inherent characteristics of an organization. Theorists tend to agree on the existence of at leas four critical phases of the organizational life cycle. The four stages include: goal-setting that gives purpose and direction to the organization; resource allocation to achieve the identified goals; evaluation to determine the effectiveness and efficiency of resource utilization; and change, based on the evaluation results, in the goals to be sought and/or the pattern of allocating the resources. Each stage and the sequence in which the four are undertaken must be acknowledged by the unit leadership.

Goal-setting. Initially, organizations tend to form in respect to the achievement of some specific purposes. In a 'young' organization, these goals are generally fresh and reasonably evident. In an 'older' organization, the purposes have become obscured in the minds of most organizational members. The attention of the group has shifted to the mechanics of the operation. This becomes an important factor because knowledge and acceptance of the goals increases the potential for attainment. The responsibility of any leader, and particularly one in an established organization, becomes readily evident. He must see that a commitment is made to define and agree on the goals justifying the existence of the organization. Failure on their first step undermines fruitful consideration of the remaining three stages.

In the private sector of our free enterprise system, the goal of profit tends to give at least one well-defined focus to the manager's task. In the public arena, and in education especially, the administrator is not so fortunate. Multiple ends are usually stated. Public educational institutions are expected to develop a man socially and intellectually. They are looked to for vocational direction, citizenship training, leisure time guidance, and family life education. It is not so much that these goals are contradictory but problems result when the time comes to assign a priority to each purpose for the allotting of available resources. Since the goals for education do not lend themselves to easy definition, analysis, and evaluation, efforts to resolve goal-oriented conflicts have often been side-stepped in favor of arguments over less abstract issues. Granting the difficulty of agreeing on the ranking of educational purposes, avoiding dialogue of this nature and seeking resolution of differences is not achieved without paying a price.

Studies regarding the status of goal-setting in organizations have begun to highlight the dangers. Considerable goal displacement begins to take place in the ensuing vacuum. Organizational participants substitute personal goals when ends are non-existent or are so nebulous as to be without meaning. Since employee morale is often closely related to the satisfaction that comes from accomplishing a task and reaching a goal, educational personnel are restricted in their opportunity to achieve such a level of satisfaction in the absence of identifiable ends. They must usually be satisfied with the reaching of personal goals, but this is not the equivalent of attaining collectively established purposes. The substitution of personal goals for group ends also opens the possibility that individual purposes will be in conflict and will thereby reduce the overall accomplishment of the organization.

Finally, by passing lightly over the first phase of organizational life, a serious undermining is set in motion in respect to the remaining three stages. Recent moves toward a national assessment program and the requirements that educational objectives be defined in applying for federally funded programs, have served to draw attention to our weak capabilities in this area. Still, the situation must be viewed as being somehwat bleak. One writer even proposed that we quit trying to define our educational objectives and give more study to describing the nature of the products coming from our schools. In this way, he argued, we would begin to see if we like the output or not. However, it would appear that eventually the same basic questions would have to be asked regarding the qualities to be valued in the educational products. In the end, society must face these knotty, goal-setting issues, and administrators must encourage this confrontation in order that leaders might have a sound, defensible base on which to build an effective, educational unit.

Resource allocation. Once organizational purposes have been formulated, there is need for the organization to have some structure and substance. The bureaucratic framework is not unrelated to the task to be served and the nature of the personnel to be involved. The pattern adopted tends to define personnel relationships, communication channels, career possibilities, and the general rules and regulations necessary for an orderly operation. The importance of this structure has too often been underestimated by educational leaders. Line-staff designs have been followed that were originated for military and industrial use. When more highly trained, professionally oriented employees are placed in such a structure, there is some validity to the concern that realization of an innovative, productive climate is being hampered. The school administrator should understand that there is nothing sacred about an organizational chart based on a strict line-staff concept. With the rapid increase in the number of supporting personnel being used in educational units, plus the trend toward more differentiated teaching roles, there is strong argument for the development of bureaucratic patterns more closely fitted to the goals sought and the educational level of the personnel involved.

In addition to the routine manner in which we have tended to assign staff members, the allocation of the financial resources of the organization have often been carried out annually with only casual reference to what has been accomplished in the past and the special programs and adjustments needed in the coming period. The budgeting process has been deadly in some instances, when it might have been a real stimulus to increased appraisal and planning. Admittedly in some cases the scarcity of funding has been a real problem. Limited financial support has come to be viewed as inevitable by some leaders and the willingness to compete for resources has slowly diminished. Established costs and accepted expenditure patterns appear to eliminate any opportunity to modify the operation. The financial problems come to be an easy and ready justification for continuing the status quo. Even a rearrangement of available resources is rejected. The result comes to be a perpetuation of an allocation cycle that becomes more and more removed from any goal fulfillment.

Shortages in resources can have a positive effect. In a less affluent society, leadership is sometimes forced into greater defense of its use of resources. Requests must be justified with greater responsibility to describe past successes, present problems, and future needs. To some extent, the leaders of the last two relatively prosperous decades have not been pushed to the degree of justification. Regardless of prevailing economic conditions, however, good leadership knows that one of the most persuasive arguments for continuous and increasing support from society is the ability of the organization to show a high return for the investment.

Evaluation. The third stage of organization life involves a commitment to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of the organization. Basic questions must be asked. Have the purposes been achieved? Has the best possible use been made of the resources? As indicated before, budget-making time is a good time to make some of these judgments, but evaluation is an on-going aspect of the organization.- or should be. Many have sometimes viewed evaluation as being optional, something that may or may not be undertaken by an organization. However, the process is an essential one for any organization, from General Motors down to the local Parent Teacher Association.

Evaluation forces a definitive statement of aims as its starting point. It demands systematic observation and data collection. It requires, in terms of educational evaluation, the development and use of more sophisticated statistical analysis than we have been accustomed to in the past. This is not to imply that all educational research needs to be done at the data-processing and computer level. It is becoming clear, however, that the more deeply we probe and experiment in respect to basic educational questions, the more complex the experimental designs become in recognition of the variables being examined. With increased research competence, it may be that we are on the verge of a major break-through in providing findings that can be a base for significant improvements in our decision-making capability. In the past there has been a tendency to rely on subjective, unsubstantiated reports in comparing one educational approach to another. Now it would seem that most educational administrators have the possibility of developing reasonably strong programs in evaluation and thereby feeling much greater confidence in their organizational decisions.

Change. At the onset, it should be emphasized that change follows evaluation. After change takes place, there is further evaluation, and the cycle of evaluation-change-evaluation continues. But initially, prior to injecting adjustments into the organi z ational operation, a base must be established regarding the rationale for the change, the objectives sought, and a clear picture of the existing conditions of the operation before manipulation. Only when this preliminary work is done, is there any grounds for determining the value and effect of the changes made. The scientific nature of administration is perhaps nowhere more evident than when the organization undertakes modification. Similarly, it is at this point that one becomes painfully aware of how far we are from using or appreciating the scientific strategies demanded.

Education has witnessed many changes in recent years, and one must feel somewhat ambivalent in assessing these changes. Significant gains have been made, but there is also reason for alarm. Some changes have resulted from the desire of one administrator to keep up with another, or for one educational unit to keep abreast of another. Changes have resulted from a concern that the organization had to keep up with the latest educational trend. Subjective, superficial judgments have been collected to determine the success of the change. Administrators have felt the need to demonstrate the gains made by the change. Employees have operated under the pressure of making something work that had little, sound rationale supporting it.

We have witnessed examples in educational agencies that suggest little understanding of the strategy of initiating and implementing change. Problems generating the interest in change are poorly analyzed. Alternatives for solving the problems have not been adequately explored because of the temptation to select a solution before clarification of the problem. There has been too little refinement of programs selected and only minimal attention to the programming of

the implementation and evaluation plans. Perhaps this condemnation is too sweeping. Some educational changes have been well conceived, but in too many instances there has been a dissipation of human and physical resources. Unfortunately, our ineptness in this fourth phase of the organizational cycle has come when an excellent national climate exists for change.

Conclusion

There is reason to close on a positive note. Despite many of the failings cited throughout this paper, there is justification for optimism. Past weaknesses are receiving a great deal of attention. Devotion to the technical and human relations requirements seems to be giving away to some extent to an examination of broader problems and a search for meaningful strategies to guide administrative efforts.

Hopefully, leadership will be relentless in seeking to establish and maintain a relationship between man's basic nature and needs and the activity of each educational organization. Organizations and societal institutions do not function in isolation of man's basic drives and expectations. Since organizations exist to serve and enhance mankind, man becomes the common denominator to our organizational endeavors and must be thoroughly understood.

A second insight essential to a leader is the understanding of the principles inherent in organizational life. An organization must have a unity to its functions. Therefore, the basic elements of an organization, such as the four discussed in this paper, must be acknowledged, studied, and understood. The various parts of the organization must mesh in machine-like manner if goals are to be realized. The leadership determines if this integration takes place. The leader makes the difference between a responsive, effective organization and one that simply maintains itself in a self-fulfilling manner. This is what makes administration such a challenging task.

CURRENT STATUS AND PROBLEMS OF STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES

Joseph A. Malik
Assistant Professor of Education
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado

Introduction

No educational institution has made more effort to project an image of concern for the student than the community junior college. Junior college catalogs stress the importance of the guidance function and describe their programs with such phrases as "student centered," "personalized," "individualized," etc. All of the major textbooks in the junior college field stress the importance of student services. Presidents of community colleges frequently suggest that students will receive more attention and better assistance by attending a community college rather than a four-year college or a university. And these claims are not without some foundation.

A number of factors have made educators in the junior college field particularly concerned about the need for student services. The diversity of the student body brought about by the "open door" admissions policy, the discrepancy between students' goals and abilities, and high attrition rates are all reminders that student services are necessary.

In serving a diverse student body enrolled in a wide range of programs, the role of student personnel services is critical. College students need assistance of many kinds. The beginning of a college career is an important time for any young person. There are numerous decisions to be made which may affect the student's future. Selecting a major and making a vocational choice are difficult decisions with life-long consequences. In addition, students frequently have anxieties about grades, inter-personal relationships, parental pressures, the draft, and many other problems. All of these concerns fall within the domain of the student personnel worker. It is his job to help students deal with these problems and make their decisions. This is a tremendously important task which carries a great responsibility.

Status of Student Personnel Services

A few years ago it would have been much more difficult to assess the current status and problems of student personnel services in junior colleges. Most of the studies available were limited in scope, regional in nature, or suffered from weak research design or inadequate sampling techniques. Today, thanks to a two-year study by the National Committee for Appraisal and Development of Junior College Student Personnel Programs, we are on much safer ground. The report of that study, Junior College Student Personnel Programs: Appraisal and Development, stands as a milestone in the history of junior college student personnel services. The study makes most other research studies in this field obsolete because it was national in scope and was based upon campus visitations and extensive interviewing. In addition, the research was carried out by some of the most able persons in the junior college field. Because of a well-planned research design, systematic research and careful analysis of the data, this study has had a significant impact upon student personnel programs throughout the country. Many of the findings of this study are not surprises, but they document more substantially than ever before the current practices in junior college student personnel work.

What is the status of junior college student personnel services today? How well are students being served? How adequate are present programs? Writing in the foreward of the report to the Carnegie Corporation, T. R. McConnell, Chairman of the National Committee for Appraisal and Development of Junior College Student Personnel Programs stated, "when measured against criteria of scope and effectiveness, student personnel programs in community colleges are woefully inadequate."[1] These are harsh words, indeed, but apparently McConnell felt that it would be inappropriate to be less than candid. Let us hope that his words will help to stimulate thought and action. In order to understand the summary of findings of this report, one should be aware of the goals of the study as established by the National Committee:[2]

1. To analyze the cultural context within which junior colleges operate.
2. To define critical research needs in junior college student personnel work.
3. To appraise training needs and resources for staffing programs
4. To explore developmental potentialities within selected junior colleges.
5. To appraise current programs and staff resources.
6. To formulate a series of recommendations for strengthening junior college student personnel programs in the years ahead.

It is also helpful to understand the organizational scheme into which services were categorized by the researchers. This was partially a matter of convenience, but they are well-structured administrative units:[3]

1. Admissions, Registration, and Records
2. Placement and Financial Aids
3. Student Activities
4. Guidance and Counseling
5. Central Administrative Unit
6. Special Services (optional)

The above breakdown is useful because it explains the frame of reference of the researchers, but also because it can serve as a criterion measure against which other student personnel programs may be compared. The committee further formulated 21 basic functions, each of which fits into one of the first five administrative units. The research team then attempted to determine the extent to which each institution fulfilled the basic functions.

Following is a summary statement of ten of the major findings of the study as prepared by Dr. Raines:[4]

1. Three-Fourths of the Junior Colleges Have Inadequate Student Personnel Programs.
2. Adequate Guidance and Counseling is Provided in Less Than One-Half of the Colleges.
3. Adequate Provision of Career Information is Extremely Rare in Junior Colleges.
4. Coordinative, Evaluative, and Up-grading Functions are the Least Effectively Provided of all Functions.
5. Almost None of the Junior Colleges Have the Resources to Serve as Community Guidance Centers.
6. Student Personnel Programs Lack the Professional Leadership that Would Enhance Development.
7. Current Staffing Patterns are Grossly Inadequate Both Quantitatively and Qualitatively.

8. The Nature and Purposes of Student Personnel Work have not been Interpreted Effectively.
9. A Favorable Climate for Program Development is Lacking at State Levels.
10. University Training Programs Have Given Insufficient Attention to the Special Needs of Junior Colleges.

Exhaustive editorial comment could be included with each of these summary statements. For the "official analysis" of these findings, the reader should consult the complete report. Another useful document - perhaps a popularized version of the Carnegie Report - is the monograph by Charles C. Collins published by the American Association of Junior Colleges in 1967.[5]

The critical task for junior college student personnel workers is to do their own analyses. The Carnegie Report and the Collins report speak for themselves. The data are in and the official verdict of the research team has been rendered. What remains is the awesome task of building a plan of action which will bring about the careful, constructive building of sound student personnel programs utilizing the knowledge base provided by the Carnegie Report. The tremendous diversity found among two-year colleges suggests that it would be inappropriate for all colleges to establish identical student personnel programs. But at the same time it is not necessary for any junior college to start from the beginning. The Carnegie Report represents a set of guidelines for student personnel services which junior colleges can effectively use in planning and development.

Not all two-year colleges may see fit to implement every one of the tasks related to each of the "functions" of a comprehensive student personnel program. What is important, however, is that each institution determine the extent to which these tasks should be fulfilled based upon a careful evaluation of local needs. This lack of systematic planning based upon evaluations is the glaring inadequacy which has been identified in two-year colleges throughout the country.

In spite of the many inadequacies of student personnel programs in two-year colleges identified in the Carnegie Report, there were some hopeful signs reported. One encouraging finding is that approximately ten percent of the student personnel programs can provide leadership in the development of programs in other institutions. The "lighthouse" programs can serve as models of sound organization and practice.

Another hopeful sign is that the need for strong student personnel programs in two-year colleges has received national visibility and Federal recognition. Several pieces of Federal legislation can provide assistance in the development of student personnel programs. This legislation would include the Vocational Education Act, the MDTA Act, the Higher Education Facilities Act and the Education Professions Development Act.

A Third positive indication is that junior college student personnel workers as a group are growing in strength and are taking on an identity of their own. This has been encouraged by leadership provided by the American Association of Junior Colleges and the American Personnel and Guidance Association in recent years. Since the Carnegie Report was published, there has been evidence that two-year colleges have been expanding and improving their student personnel programs. Moreover, there is evidence that universities are up-grading training programs and developing new programs with the community college counselor in mind.

Critical Needs and Recommendations

One of the great strengths of the Carnegie Report was that it provided for careful attention to needs and recommendations. This paper would be incomplete if it did not include at least the brief summary of recommendations which appeared in the Junior College Journal:[6]

1. Staffing standards: Staffing patterns must be established that will enable development of effective student personnel programs in every junior college.
2. Program interpretation: The nature, purposes, and requirements of satisfactory programs for the junior college must be effectively interpreted to those in policy level positions; to those involved in the instructional programs of junior colleges; to those engaged in graduate training of student personnel specialists and counselors; and to those for whom the program is designed, namely the students in the community.
3. Leadership development: Adequate training opportunities must be provided for those who are engaged in or will be assuming leadership roles in the development of student personnel programs.
4. Counselor preparation: A stepped-up program of recruitment and training of junior college counselors must be achieved with full recognition of the importance of supervised internships in junior college settings.
5. Criteria development: Criteria and sources of related data pertaining to the development of student personnel programs must be sought through the efforts of research centers and junior colleges.
6. Field consultants: Those student personnel specialists in junior colleges having the background and experience to serve in leadership capacities must be made available as field consultants to junior colleges.
7. Demonstration centers: Those junior colleges with the strongest student personnel programs in various regions of the country must be provided the necessary resources to become demonstration and developmental centers.
8. Career information: Adequate methods for analysis, preparation, and distribution of career information must be established in conjunction with related agencies at federal, state, and local levels.
9. Community service: Experimentation and development of community guidance centers within junior colleges must be launched.
10. Centralized coordination: Centralized coordination for implementation of those recommendations must be provided at national, regional, and state levels.

These ten recommendations appear to be a big order. Yet, there will not be sound student personnel programs on any kind of widespread basis until most junior colleges meet these recommendations. Obviously not every junior college will be able to meet them, just as not every junior college is able to offer a truly comprehensive curriculum.

For many years, junior college educators have been saying that guidance and counseling are an integral part of the institutional offerings, and that this is the unique strength of the junior college. Recent research, particularly the Carnegie Study, has shown that this simply has not been true in a disturbingly large majority of colleges. It is of utmost importance that junior college student personnel administrators respond to the challenges before them. The time is now and the climate is right.

Some Thoughts for the Future

With the tremendous emphasis upon higher education, demands upon the community college for the future will most certainly be heavy. The Educational Policies Commission has stated that opportunity for higher education should be accessible to all students. As community junior colleges approach that goal, the responsibility and the burden on the student personnel worker increases. The challenge is great, but it must be met.

In this last section, consideration will be given to three topics which merit the attention of those who influence or control policy development. These topics may not be the most important issues in student personnel services, but they are pertinent, particularly in view of the Carnegie Report.

The first is for full-time counselors. For a variety of reasons - probably mostly financial - many schools and colleges have employed only part-time counselors. There may be a full-time director or coordinator, but the counselors, for the most part, also teach - frequently half-time. This practice is usually defended on the basis that "counselors should not lose touch with the classroom situation." Many administrators, who do not really understand the function of counseling, have upheld this practice.

Counseling at all levels is fast becoming a true profession. With training programs improving and becoming more accessible, the competencies of counselors in our schools and colleges have increased rapidly in the last decade. Many people are entering the field with a sole commitment to counseling, and not a variety of ambitions. Research has made much more information available to the counselor. The well-trained counselor is not an "arm-chair" conversationalist. He will do well to keep up-to-date in his own field, without attempting to keep current in one or two teaching fields besides. The Carnegie Report has made it very clear that the counseling profession has a tremendous task before it in the community college. We do not have lawyer-psychologists or doctor-engineers. Certainly this sort of practice, if it ever does happen, is not advocated by the American Bar Association or the A.M.A. The sooner the counselor becomes a "true professional," the sooner he will approach the kind of expertise expected of him.

The second concern is "realistic counseling." This was identified as one of the highest priority problems in California's junior colleges.[7] First, let us identify what realistic counseling is not. It is not a counselor making a decision for a student; it is not counseling a student "into" a given occupation or curriculum on the basis of two or three test scores. The term "realistic" must refer to the student's point of view and set of values. It is not the counselor's function to decide what is realistic. It may be unfortunate, but no amount of research data, or test scores, can tell the counselor what is realistic for a given student. The counselor, however, can assist in a realistic decision in several ways: he can interpret test scores into meaningful information; he can explore with the counselee important values and attitudes; he can supply relevant factual information. It is in this last category that counselors must develop greater proficiency. Counseling is not a situation in which two people pool their ignorance. The counselor must be able to help the student understand the world of work; the counselor must be able to interpret the implications of automation, and he should help the student prepare for change. Counseling will be realistic if it helps the student understand himself, his environment, and his alternatives. Decisions should be made by the counselee. It should be recognized, and it should not be alarming, that the counselor may

influence the counselee. What is of concern is the counselor who attempts to impose his views, attitudes, and decisions on the student. This kind of technique (or lack of) does not help the student face his problems, and precious little is really accomplished.

The last concern is related to the second. It is social change. Only in recent years - during the age of automation - have educators and others become concerned with the implications of change, particularly in relation to employment. The impact of rapid technological change on the work of the counselor has been given little concern. Yet, automated knowledge is affecting almost every aspect of American life. Jobs are being eliminated by machines and new ones are being created faster than one can imagine. During the lives of the students enrolled in our community colleges today, there will be almost incomprehensible changes in the world of work. This will be complicated by the continued trend of urbanization. It may be necessary, even in this century, to re-define the concepts of work and leisure.

The society of 2000 will be fighteningly different from what we know in 1968. What will that society be like? Counselors will not be able to answer that question for their counselees. But counselors can help students identify some of the implications of change. They can help students have some understanding of the problems of an automated age. Loughary[8] has suggested that:

> Counselors might begin to help pupils distinguish between the function "job," and the function "vocation." In this sense, a job is the means by which one earns a living, and a vocation is that activity from which one derives a sense of direction, purpose, achievement, and contribution. While job and vocation may be one and the same for some, they must be different activities for others - not by choice, but due to the society in which we live.

These are complex concepts. The implications are many, but they are as certain as change itself. This is not only change for the counselor, but change for the junior college as well. Higgins and Thurstone have warned:

> Assuming the junior colleges will accept this great challenge, it is unlikely that student personnel workers will perform the same functions in the same ways as now. Unless we are able to retrain and retool for a more creative role, we will be as anachronistic as comptometer operators and bookkeepers.[9]

REFERENCES

1. Junior College Student Personnel Programs: Appraisal and Development (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1965), foreword.
2. Ibid., p. 11.
3. Ibid., p. 16.
4. Ibid., pp. 20-33.
5. Charles C. Collins, Junior College Student Personnel Programs: What They Are and What They Should Be. (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967).
6. Max R. Raines, "The Student Personnel Situation," Junior College Journal, XXXVI (February, 1966), p. 8.
7. Basil H. Peterson, Critical Problems and Needs of California Junior Colleges (published jointly by the California Junior College Association and the California State Department of Education, 1965), p. 57.

8. John W. Loughary (ed.) Counseling, A Growing Profession (Washington, D.C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1965), p. 45.
9. Sadie Higgins and Alice Thurstone, "Student Personnel in the Junior Colleges in the Years Ahead," College Student Personnel Work in the Years Ahead, Gordon Klopt (ed.) (Washington, D.C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association, Monograph No. 7, 1966), p. 54.

THE EXTRA-INSTITUTIONAL OBLIGATIONS OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE ADMINISTRATOR

Duane Anderson
Assistant Professor, Higher Education
Director of the Office of Community College Affairs
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

The subject of extra-institutional forces and how the community college administrator should react to these forces is a critical problem. As the Director of an Office of Community College Affairs at the University of Iowa, I have the responsibility for developing relationships between the community colleges in the state and the University. We have a number of strange organizational patterns which I'll use as examples of some types of extra-institutional forces which exist in our state. I believe the way an administrator views these extra-institutional forces depends a great deal on his past and present positions. As a former two-year college administrator, I look differently at extra-institutional forces than I might had I never held such a position.

I'd like to discuss with you three or four different topics. I'll begin with the basic frame of reference in which administrative decisions are made. You will have to bring yourself into the picture in order to gain much from it. I'd like first to define some terms relative to community college administration, and then to describe that basic frame of reference for administrators which they can call upon when they are faced with extra-institutional forces.

Personnel Preparation

The fact that we have a new system of community colleges and a whole new system of administrators in Iowa is what brought to the attention of many of us the lack of experience on the part of administrators in dealing with these extra-institutional forces. We had a very critical year for community colleges in 1965 in Iowa, the year that a system of fifteen community colleges was established. We don't have an Iowa master plan for community colleges. What we have is a series of in-house documents, that is, a series of research studies. It would appear that we don't believe in going outside the state for assistance on such studies. We appoint somebody either from the Regents' Universities, or the State Department of Public Instruction to do the study for us. Therefore, we don't really know where we are going because we fail to obtain an objective viewpoint by an outsider. The last study done by the State Department of Public Instruction conveyed the concept of the intermediate school district intertwined with the community college program. As a result, we hired administrators who were basically secondary and elementary oriented. Because of this orientation they have had some difficulty in developing a mode of administrative behavior compatible with the community college. They did not have a community college point of view. We have seen this most vividly as they have reacted and related to outside influences. I suppose I have seen it because this is where I come into contact with them. I am sure that their backgrounds as elementary and secondary administrators have caused problems in other areas of administration: their faculties, with business and finance, and with academic problems, along the line. We've noticed particularly their lack of sensitivity in handling relationships with the outside agencies such as regional accrediting associations.

Nationally, the demand for new community college administrators is fantastic. And we certainly haven't seen the end of this tremendous demand yet. A study by Raymond Shultz at Florida State University found that there would be a need between 1965-70 for some three thousand new community college administrators, presumably with community college competencies and with the ability to think as community college administrators and deal effectively with these outside influences. Last year there were seventy-two new community colleges; there will probably be that many this next year. There are at least 920 of these two-year institutions now spread across the country. There are 1,600,000 students in these institutions. All of us realize that this expansion is bringing into the field a large group of people who have little or no experience with this particular type of institution. Learning a mode of behavior is certainly called for, and a preparation program for administrators is required in order to handle the problems we are going to face in the next few years.

Extra-Institutional Agencies Change

Along with the problem of finding competent administrators we find another major problem. There is a change in the approach and aggressiveness of the outside agencies. There was a time when the outside agencies paid little attention to community colleges. In Iowa, for instance, until this past year the State Board of Regents, as an outside agency, cared very little about what happened in community colleges. Suddenly, this year they are willing to go to the extreme of releasing faculty members from other responsibilities to be involved in the examination and approval of these particular institutions. This only reflects a part of their broad interest in these new community colleges.

New State Boards have been established. California went to a State Board for Junior Colleges in July of this year. Colorado has a new State Board for Community Colleges. Massachusetts and Minnesota have gone to a centralized State Board of Junior College Control. More and more controlling agencies are being formed that are concerned with the community colleges. These agencies are preparing people to look at the community college, but our question is, are we preparing administrators who can, in turn, react intelligently toward these outside agencies? As far as I can tell, we are not meeting this critical need. We have not developed a frame of reference within which to prepare people to do this particular task. I think the problem is critical. The question is, how are we going to get people ready to respond to these influences that are impinging upon the community colleges.

Let me give you a few definitions. First of all, I am talking about extra-institutional relations. Clyde Blocker, President at Harrisburg Area Community College in Pennsylvania, and one of the technical experts on community college education, talks about extra institutional agencies in relation to the curriculum. He uses this term in connection with the determinants of the community college curriculum. These extra-institutional forces include all those external forces which constantly impinge upon the curriculum.

I could make a broad list of various agencies and forces that we could discuss, but I am going to discuss just five of them. First, there are the regional accrediting agencies. These agencies have taken on a major role in controlling and developing the institution. We found, as I mentioned before, that in the State of Iowa administrators did not know how to respond to the regional accrediting agency. In fact, as an example of these poor reactions, two of our institutions

that have attempted to transfer their accreditation from the old district to the new one were turned down by the North Central Accrediting Association. We must become very active in trying to find out what our administrators' responsibilities are and how they should respond to accrediting agencies, either regional or professional.

The second kind of agency is the State Department of Instruction "Coordinating Governing Board." This type of Board can precipitate a whole set of relationships between the local school administrators and the local community college administrators. I am not sure that anyone has the last answer as to how those relationships should be developed. We see here another example of an extra-institutional force in relation to the area of curriculum approval. What should be the responsibility of the local board and the local administrators as compared with the State Board in terms of approving the curriculum? What kinds of relationship should be established, that is, what guidelines or what rules must be developed and how should an administrator react to an infringement upon his authority as the administrator? In determining what the curriculum should be, there is such a thing as institutional integrity, and most of the regional accrediting agencies have made some very firm statements as to what they consider appropriate institutional integrity in the community college. But how many college administrators even know these guidelines exist, and how many of them have incorporated this kind of thinking into behavior? Those of us who are going to be in administrative positions must come up with a rationale for dealing with governing and coordinating boards as they relate to many problems, and these include the curriculum.

The third outside or extra-institutional force that the community college administrator must learn to recognize is the Legislature. Maybe other states don't have the same kind of legislature as we have, but dealing with ours is a full-time job. This is part of the community college administrator's role that consumes a tremendous amount of time. Our legislature passed a good enabling act in 1965 at the same time that yours in Colorado acted. However, the Iowa legislature forgot one thing; they suddenly found out, as your legislature is going to find out next year, I suppose, that it costs money to run a community college system. They didn't seem to recognize the financial obligation. They went right ahead with all kinds of commitments and established a system based upon the principle that the state would finance this particular program. In the first year, believe it or not, they appropriated no money at all. None! And for the next year, in their largesse, they appropriated $6,000,000 when they knew it would cost $9,000,000 to finance the system they had established. We ended up practically begging. Our administrators went in and said, "What are we going to do? You didn't provide any funds." They replied, "We will have to give you a bail-out bill to help you out of this unfortunate situation that your poor administration got you into." The legislature called this irresponsible administration on the part of the community college administrators because they had paid out money during the first year of operation when no funds were coming in. The legislature in Iowa finally appropriated four and one-half million dollars for the six and one-half million dollar debt that we had accrued during the first year of operation. This is an extreme example of the kinds of problems faced in dealing with legislatures. How does the administrator react to legislative pressure? We cannot simply give in. We cannot just say that the authority is in the legislature and there is nothing to be done. We had a number of administrators decide to cut back a little. That was a critical decision. I sat in on a Board meeting where the administrator went to the Board and said that the only way they could survive the situation was to cut back twenty members of the

staff. This, to me, is a very unfortunate administrative decision. I think we should have done something other than that, even if we had to go before the legislative committee and plead poverty. This institution is going to suffer for years because of that one administrative decision. It impaired the faculty morale for years to come. This is an example of an administrative decision made in reaction to a decision by the state legislature. The student of administration must be made aware that these types of situations may arise in order that he may deal with them more effectively. Such experiences must be built into the preparation program. However, there is no manual that we can establish in which it says if the legislature does this, turn to page 27 and here is your reaction. But we do have a responsibility to create a frame of reference for these community college administrators which will allow them to come up with appropriate administrative behavior.

The fourth agency, and one we are just beginning to face now, and one that you are going to face if you haven't already, is the professional education association. Which is the appropriate association for the community college faculty? We know that the American Federation of Teachers is extremely interested in unionizing faculty members. We know that the AAUP has been cool toward the organizing of all community college faculty members. Also, there is a new national association of community and junior college instructors affiliated with the NEA, with quite an aggressive and perhaps an appropriate answer to organizing community college faculty members. I'm not promoting the NEA, or the AFT, or the AAUP, but I am saying that somehow the community college administrator must become familiar with this area. A new relationship between faculty, students, and administrators is coming into existence in the area of governance. It makes a tremendous difference, for example, whether occupational instructors are associated with the American Vocational Association, or they are part of some of the professional engineering associations. Certainly the climate in which you're going to live in your institution is going to depend upon the leadership which you give in this phase of dealing with an outside agency. You cannot expect to develop a climate within your own institution anymore without taking into account the effects that these outside agencies are going to have upon that climate. There was a time when perhaps a man like Joe Cosant - a very dynamic administrator - could, through his own personality, build a climate within his institution. However, I don't think even a Joe Cosand can do this alone anymore. I think we have to realize that we must deal effectively with these influential outside agencies. This is the kind of competency I would like to see somehow taught to community college administrators.

The final group, and the largest and most diverse of all agencies, are private citizens and the pressure groups they represent. A college administrator is constantly faced with extra-institutional forces represented by the private citizen, the DAR, nurses, lawyers, tax payers' associations, etc. They all play a part, and somehow we must build within our competency the rationale for dealing with them administratively in the community colleges.

The Community College Philosophy

There are certain appropriate reactions for a community college administrator to make. I believe in diversity and I accept the fact that we are going to have some major differences in community colleges. However, I think that we need to establist what a community college is and to define the community college philosophy and then make our decisions based on that philosophical position. I do not believe

there is a universal theory of administration in higher education that holds water, but I do think there is a philosophy of the community college than can be used as the basis for making decisions which are appropriate in almost any community college situation. Until we agree on this philosophical point of view, we are going to make decisions that are divisive. In our own state, the legislature unfortunately allowed for two kinds of institutions to be developed under the same act. There is the option of establishing a community college or an area vocational school. I think there is a different philosophy in each of these two institutions. The administrator of an area vocational school is going to react differently to outside forces merely because his philosophical position is different from that of the community college administrator. I am not saying it has to be, but I think it too often is.

Wisconsin has a very fine vocational school system which goes back to the beginning of vocational school education, 1906, when the Douglas Commission met in Massachusetts and decided that there would be a dual system of post-high school education. Through the 1917 Smith-Hughes Act and up to the present, Wisconsin has adopted the philosophy of dualism in lower division, post-high school education. But they are changing. They are moving toward the comprehensive community philosophy. I agree with this trend. I fought for four or five years for the broader, comprehensive kind of program, but people who were in vocational education at that time had a great deal of fear regarding what would happen to their particular program if they moved in that direction. So they maintained what I facetiously refer to as the Smith-Hughes mentality. The Smith Hughes law and the Smith Hughes Act were extremely important. The money that states get from vocational education acts is extremely important for colleges. However, the situation has changed since 1917, and the philosophy should change along with it. It is unfortunate that some vocational educators still maintain a 1917 philosophy. It is inappropriate for these times. There is just not much call any more for harness makers, or mechanics to fix Model T's. There are many of these pressure groups that the community college administrator must learn to react appropriately toward. And further, he must learn to react as a community college administrator - not as a private citizen, not as a vocational educator, not as a junior college administrator, and certainly not as a secondary school administrator. Now, it is very appropriate for a secondary school principal to act like a secondary school principal. The decisions that he makes are appropriate for his institution. But when that same man with that same philosophy begins to make decisions about the community college operation, particularly in terms of extra-institutional organizations, they are often inappropriate.

Any institute or program which attempts to train community college administrators must take into account the real needs of the individual who are going to be called upon to perform this role. Although the learning of specific administrative skills must be a component of any such program, this should not be its only thrust. For example, the emphases should be not only on learning a budgeting system. You can do that in a few weeks; or on learning how to develop a catalog. You can teach someone else how to do that. You can even train someone to establish a curriculum. On the other hand, it is quite another matter to develop a community college philosophy and to get it across to the student of community college administration. You have to be something of an evangelist. I suppose you must be really convinced that there is such a thing as a community college philosophy, and then get it across in a way that does not antagonize people. Unless we develop a true community college philosophy among the men who are going to take over administrative positions in community colleges, everything else we do will be wrong.

Areas of Administration

I see administration as composed of four major areas, two of which are rather bureaucratically oriented and lend themselves quite easily to study and to the development of methods. In a bureaucracy, or an organization operating under bureaucratic principles, you can assign roles, establish regulations and proceed almost without regard for the situation. The first two areas which operate this way are business administration and student personnel administration. A good business manager can probably go quite easily from one institution to another with little adjustment on his part. Student personnel administration isn't quite as bureaucratic, but there is some bureaucracy. There are some roles, some old organizational theories, and some patterns of administration that seem to hold true in student personnel administration. The other two, by contrast, are non-bureaucratic and because of this create some different problems in regard to behavior.

The third area is academic administration. The whole area of academic administration in higher education has become complicated by new faculty dismissal procedures, new negotiation procedures, etc. There was a time, if we go back to the golden age of administration, when the administration administered the academic program. This has changed. A Clark Kerr no longer demands that teaching assistants will do something. They, on the other hand, are not reluctant to tell the administrator what he must do. The administrator today performs a much different role in academic administration than he did a few years ago. Academic administration has changed on the university level; and do not think the community colleges are going to escape it. The community college administrator is going to be faced with a new kind of faculty, a new militancy. Academic administration is no longer what it was and our community colleges are totally unprepared for the change. Community college administrators, in many instances, came out of the secondary school atmosphere. They were used to being the only educated professional in the school system and they often treated their faculty members in condescending manners. This type of administrator is in for a shock. I know what is going to happen to some of these administrators when they run into some of the younger teachers coming out of our graduate schools today. The new breed of faculty members for community colleges believes in academic freedom. They feel strongly about the rights that faculty members have, that they should be included in the development of curriculum, and that they should have a say in the administration of the institution. At the very least our administrators are going to have to go through a whole reorientation in terms of academic administration.

Finally, we get to the last administrative function, that of Institutional Administration. I believe this to be a critical area. We used to call this area simply "public relations." The alumni association falls within this area. A whole new area of administration is being brought about by the change in the concern of extra-institutional agencies for higher education, and the community college specifically.

Thus, we are developing a new breed of administrator. These new administrators generally operate at the vice-president's level in a major institution, and perhaps at the president's level in a two-year college. A whole new set of concepts of administrative behavior is developing.

The Changing Nature of the Institution

Let me suggest a frame of reference that I think is necessary in order to react appropriately to these extra-institutional agencies. First of all, the community college administrator is faced with a doubly complicated problem in establishing a rationale for administrative behavior. Corson, in his book, The Governance of Colleges and Universities, says that the task of leadership in higher education may be supported or challenged by institutional character. What this means is that the character of two things is changing at the same time, which complicates the role of the administrator in developing rational administrative behavior. It is like firing at a moving target and then making it more complicated by having the platform on which you are standing also move, and both of them in unrelated and unpredictable directions. This is the situation that the community college administrator is in. It involves first of all a change in the character of his institution and it is changing quite radically. We know that until recently many of these institutions were under the K through 14 type of organizational pattern. The administrator naturally developed a mode of administrative behavior that was compatible with other administrators within the area, and understandable to the board of trustees or board of directors.

A second characteristic of many community colleges is that they do not have permanent campuses of their own. They live in what we refer to as the "cracks and crevices" of former public high school buildings. Somebody else took care of the problem of facilities for them. This characteristic changes drastically when new campuses are built.

Another way that the character of the institution has changed is in regard to the student body. At present we talk about very diverse student bodies in community colleges. If we were to go back fifteen or twenty years, we would find that, in most states, they were a rather homogeneous group. They were a group who were "junior college" oriented. They were quite predictable. We knew what kinds of students they were, we knew what they wanted, we knew how to administer our program to satisfy their needs. This is no longer true. The community college president now has to deal with a broad spectrum of abilities, economic statuses, political and social extremes.

We recognize that the character of the community college is changing, which creates need for a change in administrative style, but I think if we look at the bigger picture, we see that the style of administration in higher education is also changing. There have been several suggestions for administrative styles in the past, such as, Dodds "caretaker," Kerr's "mediator-initiator," and the "consensus seeker." I am suggesting that perhaps even the modern style of administrative behavior which Kerr, Litchfield and some of the other writers in administration have been expounding, is a thing of the past. Just as the Tappans and the Eliots passed from the scene at the turn of the century, perhaps the Kerrs and the Dodds today are out of date. We are saying now that perhaps no single person is capable of being an administrator in higher education. Currently there are suggestions for teams of administrators: a cadre to handle the administrative roles. These are a few of the things that are making the job of the community college administrator extremely difficult.

In review, let me identify four aspects of the preparation of community college administrators that are needed to enable him to react to the extra-institutional

forces we have been discussing. The first, and the most difficult, deals with the personality of the individual. The community college administrator must realize that personality may well make the difference between success and failure. As a suggestion, I think it is pretty good advice to get somebody on your staff who is secure enough in his own mind and his own position to be able to tell you when your personality interferes with your administrative behavior. We want to develop administrative behavior which is rational. Unfortunately, all of the behavior of an administrator is not always rational. There are those who do not realize that personality is getting in the way of administrative behavior. I do not know the answer to this problem. We have a group on our campus who are completely sold on the idea of sensitivity training. It is my opinion that something similar to this must become part of our preparation program. I think personal sensitivity is extremely critical when dealing with outside influences. Perhaps you can get away with a crippled kind of personality, a Captain Bligh kind of personality, within your own institution. However, when you start dealing with the legislature, the regional accrediting agencies, pressure groups, and these other outside forces, just the slightest idiosyncrasy is the thing they remember you for. I do not mean you have to be something you are not. You just have to learn to develop an administrative behavior which takes into account the kind of personality which would best accomplish ;your goals. A community college administrator must, when he deals with these outside agencies, develop a kind of personality that is consonant with the role expected of him.

Second is what I define as historical and philosophical point of view on the community college, especially as related to outside agencies. I am a firm believer that our community college philosophy is extremely important. I think in the past the community college has favored a passive role in relation to extra-institutional agencies. This is changing. We must now build within our new administrators a different attitude about the role of the community college. It is not a second-rate school, although it is a second-chance school. It is not a high school with ashtrays, although we will find students of all ages in attendance. It has an identity of its own.

The third concern, as we look at extra-institutional forces, is the development of a theoretical view of administrative behavior. We have spent a lot of time looking at organizational theories, but I don't believe there is one universal theory of administration in higher education. I think there is a theory of administration for public school systems, but it does not apply to college administration. I think administrative theory in the public schools is universal enough that it applies in one district about as well as another. In the business world an administrative officer in one company develops an administrative style that will hold up for him when he moves from one company to the next. When you get into higher education, though, I do not believe that it is possible to use the same administrative theory. Administration in higher education is quite different from administration in other organizations. I think that the general organizational theories that apply to business or public schools might work quite well in the areas I have mentioned such as student personnel and business administration. However, I think they apply very poorly or not at all in the non-bureaucratic areas that I mentioned previously.

Finally, I believe the junior college administrator needs a frame of reference and a set of definitions for dealing with agencies outside his own region, such as accrediting agencies. I hope that our preparation programs can give the administrator an overview of such things as the laws formulated by regulating agencies.

I think that the community college administrator should be able to give you page and paragraph on almost all the rules and regulations of the outside agencies. He must know them inside and out. We have gone beyond the time when the administrator does not need to know about anything other than his own institution.

I guess I have gone as far as I want to go in setting a frame of reference and establishing working definitions. There are a lot more definitions that could be given. I am firmly convinced that many of our problems as we deal with outside agencies stem from a lack of definitions; a semantic problem. Maybe we do not disagree as much as we think we do. Perhaps we do not use the right terms in explaining to others what it is we are trying to do in the community college.

THE ROLE OF STATE BOARDS AND THE FUNCTIONS OF THEIR STATE OFFICERS

Dr. Paul A. Elsner
Director, Community College Division
Colorado State Board for Community Colleges & Occupational Education
Denver, Colorado

Drs. Shay and Malik have asked me to discuss the role of state officers of the State Board and their functions. I would like to try to keep within that framework as much as possible. My first generalization is that state governance of community colleges looms as a very critical problem in the current history of the junior college movement. It is hard to generalize, for example, what state governance is and what it ought to be because we have had so much pluralism in this country regarding how colleges are coordinated, controlled, directed, etc., at the state level. An excellent resource is Jim Wattenbarger's recent article in the May, 1968 issue of the Junior College Journal reviewing various state patterns of leadership, coordination and financing. You can see from his article that we do not have a uniform model for state governance.

We would probably not need state governing boards of community colleges if it were not for the issue of local finance. Local junior college districts, and the junior college movement in general, rode in on local initiative. The culmination of the junior college movement in the sixties really came as a result of local initiative, not state leadership. To be sure, some states have responded to junior college needs by establishing state structures, where there had been no local initiative, causing the initial responsibility to be placed in the hands of the state rather than local districts. The most dynamic of these state systems, however, have some provision for local identity and local initiative.

Earlier in our junior college history, states that had carried out their higher education commitments with strong, constitutionally independent universities at the center of the system, had tended to resist the junior college movement. At least these states were slow to step in and move along with some kind of major junior college thrust. There are also patterns where private schools, universities and colleges have tended to take up what was considered to be the basic need for junior college education. In these states there has been even greater resistance to the public community college development. Once a state defines the junior college's role in relationship to other sectors, however, the movement begins to take hold. An example of this latter phenomena was evident in California and Michigan, two states with powerful universities, but well developed systems of junior colleges.

Moving down the next few years, I think we can see some discernible patterns. We might call the sixties somewhat of a golden era of community college growth. Some argue that we have reached our culmination. Some feel that we are still growing. I think that we have to define growth in terms of various states and regions of the country. Illinois is now starting to move very rapidly. I suspect that they are at the threshold of their major growth. California perhaps has reached some state of culmination, but there is still potential growth in that state as well. It seems more than accidental that this growth period also saw local initiative for the establishment of community colleges at its peak. This kind of local phenomena still causes local junior colleges to be formed. However, a good look down the road shows some symptoms we can hardly ignore:

1. Local citizens appear to be more willing than ever to shift local support for all public services, including the public community college, to larger, more embracing taxing jurisdiction. Hence, more state systems.

2. Community colleges experience difficulty in obtaining local support for capital expansion and operating costs once they have been established, particularly in those communities that have experienced significant demographic change from younger age populations to older age populations.

Once a community reaches some state of maturity, we find different patterns of interest for education. It is far easier, apparently, to get an institution established than to support it. I think there is perhaps an interplay of local conscience and local tax support involving the community college. On one hand the premises of the public community college are wholly acceptable to the voting public at large, but it is not easy to generate financial support from these very same citizens. The public wants junior colleges, but the question of whether they are able to support them on a long range basis is in doubt. Obviously, the major role of state boards and their officers is the finding of new monies for junior colleges.

The local tax paying citizen seems willing to transfer the support of many worthwhile enterprises to a larger tax base, i.e., the state, and indirectly to the federal level. We witnessed this pattern in Colorado last year. Under House Bill 1448, passed in 1967 by the Colorado Assembly, which created the new State Board, local junior colleges were permitted to exercise the option of joining the state system. In the process the state picks up a 100% finance program which removes local operating levies as well as debt service on capital liability. At Trinidad the citizens voted to enter the state system by over 2,500 yes votes to 19 opposed. Lamar Junior College joined the state system with 1,900 yes votes and approximately 25 to 30 no votes. At Otero these voting figures were in about the same balance. I suggest that the 19, 20 and 25 no votes are mechanical errors. Somebody must have pulled the wrong lever in the voting booth. The administration at Trinidad did nothing but transmit information about the dissolution issue. At Otero the administration supported joining the state system. At Lamar College officials supported the issue and recommended joining the state system. Mesa College and Northeastern Junior College are fairly independent districts, who highly regard local support. I reason that if the administration and the Board opposed the issue in those communities, the vote would still go 60% yes and probably not more than 40% no. This scares me because I think the wrong motives for joining the state system are behind these elections. The removal of local tax levies and capital indebtedness appears to be the primary reason for joining the system.

While the local tax paying citizen seems willing to transfer the support of such worthwhile enterprises to a larger central interest, the heavily centralized bureaucratic structures which arise as a result of the transfer often serve him less than adequately. The compromise might be a state-wide system of community colleges with explicit provisions for local control serving local needs and accompanied with some provisions for local initiative. The local citizens would contribute to the support of the college in the form of a ceiling-type local levy, which is the direction in which we would like to move in Colorado. However, since the ink is not dry on House Bill 1448, we are not in a position to introduce these changes. I think we will be in this position within the next three to five years.

Local tax levies ought to be designated for special purposes, such as for community use or for community service programs. If an institution would like to build a college theater, it ought to be able to go beyond and above the state appropriation. I also think that legitimate uses of local revenues might be something like institutional contributions to retirement programs for teachers, merit programs, and faculty development programs. However, local tax levies should be restricted to such purposes. It is not because I would not like to see more local initiative in the financial support of the local colleges, but I think once we institute local alternatives, the state could renege on its obligation to give full 100% support to operational costs. We want local districts or local communities to have taxing ability, but we do not want this taxing ability to cause motivation for providing less than 100% state support. Hence, restrictive ceiling-type local ability to tax seems the best answer to keep local and state control in delicate balance.

Interestingly, the shift from local to state support seemed evident at the last meeting of the Council of State Directors in Phoenix, Arizona where thirty-eight states were represented. At its inception the State Directors Council brought together only a handful of people. Virtually every state has some person in charge of junior colleges, while only a couple of years ago it was difficult to determine who was responsible in some states. State level responsibility has become a necessity, only if to support, to maintain, and to protect the junior college interests at the state level. Great pressures should be felt by the state leadership to vie effectively for the allocation of scarce resources. Currently, state level structures have placed a disproportionate emphasis on the needs of four-year institutions-- forcing junior colleges to press for identity. It has taken a long time for the coordinating agencies to acknowledge the junior college thrust in their states; yet the coordinating agencies are still largely responsible for the recommendations to the legislature as to where higher education money should be allocated. In California, junior college enrollments long ago reached such massive proportions that it would be absurd not to recognize the community college's role in that state's system of higher education. Yet California, I believe, moved toward a state governing board to get better representation and leadership for many complex junior college needs. Whether California gets better state leadership from a state governing board remains to be seen - perhaps its state-wide organization, The California Junior College Association, already provides the leadership it seeks.

I believe we fail to recognize that leadership must be appointed at the state level comparable to the chancellor of the state college system or the chancellor of the university system; that the leadership must operate effectively in the political network. Unfortunately, few states have set up for this latter aspect.

State boards and their staffs must still "sell" the junior college. The credibility of our mission will be tested like it never has been before. Some issues become especially vulnerable to public scrutiny as soon as we get directly involved with the state. One of these issues deals with simple performance data. As an example, attrition rates among those students registered in transfer programs are likely to be examined. Moreover, the scarcity of public resources for higher education demands that we look more critically at the success of transfer programs. We have two real conflicting forces here. I wish I could say something else, but local junior colleges are generally formed in order to provide its citizen supporters a legitimate path to a baccalaureate degree. They are not formed for the comprehensive, occupationally oriented purposes so often claimed

in our literature. When we move to statewide structures where competition for scarce monies is keen, we are bound to be asked for performance data. Some of us have taken the position that we ought to stop emphasizing our transfer function so much. Terms like transfer and terminal do not seem to hold up anymore - at least not as two primary, discrete functions. If we realistically researched our enterprise, we might be offering something like five major programs. Approximately twenty percent of our students might be enrolled in something like a college transfer program. Another twenty percent would be enrolled in a lower-skilled vocational type of curriculum covering varying time spans to complete, but usually less than a year. Another twenty percent might be enrolled in some form of technical, semi-professional curricula usually requiring a two-year associate of arts goal. At least twenty percent would be in some kind of continuing education or community service program and still another twenty percent would be taking developmental type courses. The latter program may not be defined or interpreted in terms of curriculum at all, but would constitute a fair share of the majority of the students program.

Still another pressure we will face is that the tax paying public will examine more closely the duplicating roles among several sectors in public education. The issue of how to best carry out continuing education, adult education, community service functions, should trouble many a legislative session. Currently, all sectors of higher education as well as secondary education claim these functions to a degree. I wish there were a stronger likelihood that community colleges would be given statutory clarification to carry out this role. The transfer program, continuing education and occupational education could then become nearly equal tri-functions in our community colleges.

Normally, seventy percent of all students enrolled in junior colleges are classified as freshmen, which means that something like the remaining twenty-eight percent should be sophomores, but it is even less than that. If you follow our freshmen junior college students, approximately one-third end up classified as sophomores. If you follow them into the junior year in the California system, you find something like less than one-fifth actually transfer to the University of California or the state colleges. There is a remarkable persistence, however, among that one-fifth. Most remarkable is that one of five - 3,000 of every 15,000 - were not admissible to the University of California or the state colleges, when they enrolled as junior college freshmen. In Colorado our overall salvageability of students cannot be fully interpreted until we have sufficient follow-up data; however, the masses of students who fail require that we look very carefully at our transfer role - in every state.

Our staff is asked to provide greater evidence that an occupational mission really is being carried out to the degree that we claim in our community colleges. The industrial community reinforces our technical function, but at the same time industry still puts out vast sums of money to train its personnel. If we are to perform this task, technical programs should be more carefully examined in terms of their ability to generate skilled manpower. Under broader systems approaches to unit cost accounting, we may see vocational technical education placed on an input-output model. This could mean, however, a strengthening of financial support by the federal and state level, but only to the degree that junior college leaders can develop flexible models for technical-vocational education, as well as their being able to translate resources into missions on a more quantitative basis. We hope to get off the hook at the Community College of Denver by demonstrating higher employability rates in the forty-two occupational programs President Luchsinger is implementing.

I see another more complex role of state officers - this role is new to us. It involves bringing total regional resources to bear on local problems. In the future state control and coordination will get more direction from megastructures at the federal level. We can expect absorption of states into regional service areas in order to carry out specific national goals. Projects supported by federal agencies and state agencies require greater coordinated thrust to zero in on local community problems. Regional planning areas already cross the county and state lines; so, too, will community college projects require coordinated effort within the total educational and public service community. We shall also experience a development of total systems approaches providing public services to local areas. Local districts as we know them today will begin to take on systems characteristics as they are integrated into regional, state and national missions. Distinctive features of educational units commonly regarded as secondary level, junior college level, area vocational schools and state community colleges will become fused into a larger partnership. Institutions will engage in their activities in a much less unilateral way - the main reason: the public will no longer tolerate conflicting roles and proliferation of programs - the scarcity of resources is already being felt.

State officers need to be more flexible in viewing the role of junior colleges. We should not create static, non-changing institutions. I believe that in the future some community colleges will be located in industrial parks, still others in retirement communities, still others in ethnically concentrated areas. Campuses as we know them today will be less traditional, less formal, less restrictive in the clientele they serve. There will be a new clientele for higher education and this clientele will affect the characteristics of the institution in very vital ways.

College administrators will make provisions for allowing students to participate in the setting of the curriculum and the activities in which they engage themselves. To a degree student life already is the most socially approved type of activity. This fact has to have some effect on our institutions. Perhaps as much as fifty to sixty percent of the curriculum will eventually be devoted to continuing education. The percentage of the curriculum devoted to the latter will depend on the clientele of the local community college and its proximity to characteristic consumers. Regional and community problems resulting from urbanization, unemployment and the use of leisure should affect community college programs, much more than is presently evident.

State officers must preserve the local identity of each institution in the system. Colorado has attempted in House Bill 1448 to provide some kind of local initiative and local autonomy. I do not like to use the word autonomy because I do not think tht term has much utility. We constantly use the term but it seems doubtful if institutions ever enjoy autonomy, per se, if they are part of a larger legal jurisdiction such as a "district" or a "state." I like to think of "autonomy" in different contexts. I argue that our colleges in the State of Colorado do not have autonomy in the legal sense; we have simply tried to remove restraint at the institutional level. What militates against having autonomy in state systems in a whole myriad of accompanying system restraints imposed on the institutions. The controller's office, for example, has a basic governmental accounting function which restricts autonomy. The purchasing function for colleges within a state system is a statewide operation. Moreover, the colleges cannot ignore state administrative codes. In recognition of these problems, we have attempted to work within various frameworks and to liberalize some restrictive areas where we legally can. We won last year, for example, in providing institutions with their own purchasing services. Business managers function as state purchasing agents rather than having to go through voucher system on buying small items.

In areas of governmental accounting we are somewhat restricted. No matter what our philosophy, the institutions still have to maintain accounting systems and be subject to state audits. We have tried to respond to these circumstances which are necessary by developing a committee on the development of accounting procedures which consisted of the chairman of the legislative Audits Committee of the State of Colorado, the Budget Analyst of the Commission of Higher Education, a representative from the Governor's office and accounts and control in the controller's office. We had a junior college business manager chair the committee to develop a uniform system of budgeting and accounting which provided what we felt to be a workable management tool for handling fiscal procedures for each college. We were able to depart from a lot of university and state college practices in the accounting area in developing an accounting system tailored to junior college needs. By working with a consultant on the mechanical and technical problems, we felt that an accounting system could be developed that would alleviate some of the problems of restraint. State four-year colleges and universities do not have a uniform system of accounting. Each of them operates differently. The Commission on Higher Education feels that our budgeting and accounting manual is a fairly valuable document for use elsewhere in the higher education sectors, even though it suited our needs quite specifically. If there is another development in accounting and budgeting in the state, it will grow out of the junior college's budget request for a system tailored to our needs.

We have taken a different role in overall policy determination. In the area of policy we have appointed an advisory committee to the Board. We have had other advisory committees, but this is the first one in the area of policy determination. In the past we have had an operating state-wide policies committee develop a sabbatical leave program and personnel policies affecting health and welfare. We just implemented at our last Board meeting several policies relating to leaves. We felt that we did better than the local districts were able to do, but we developed these out of committee-faculty, administrators and presidents - in those junior colleges that are a part of the state system.

We now have a statewide Advisory Committee on basic policy. We have found it difficult to get student representation. I cannot find students to appoint on committees and at this time only two students sit on this committee. When subcommittees are formed involving such areas as student affairs, we intend to use more students in an advisory capacity.

Before we develop any policies at the statewide level, they will be reviewed by the advisory council of students, faculty and administrators. We may not always agree with this advisory council, but we feel it is important that they share in the burden of the mistakes we make in policy determination. This method of working with an advisory council will alleviate some of the problems of having state level staff creating policy without considering the various issues and problems at the various local district levels. On this committee we have both state system college representation and local district representation. We include representatives from community colleges which are not in the state system on some of our committees. On our budgeting and accounting committee we actually had three local district business managers and two state system staff. We are trying to maintain a similar balance of local and state system college representation on other committees - first, because we value local district staff input and experience, and second, because their representation will ultimately ease the local districts transition into the state system when that occurs.

The State Board has adopted a policy of having the presidents in four times annually. We have met only twice thus far - once on a tuition issue and once on overall planning problems. The purpose of these quarterly meetings for presidents is to have an appraisal of the problems ahead. The sessions extend part of the day and to dinner in the evening when we sit down informally and try to discuss problems affecting the system. We still are not providing enough of this kind of communication.

These are my closing remarks - it is probably appropriate that we closed on this last, but most important role of state boards and staff, that of preserving local identity. If there can be one single feature of a successful state system, it is the provision states ought to make for local identity and local responsibility.

ROLES OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS IN BUILDING THE BUDGET

Mr. Donald Shore
Business Officer
Mesa College
Grand Junction, Colorado

Administrators in community colleges bear the major responsibility for budget building. The primary responsibility belongs to the President and the Business Officer. The President is responsible for total operation of the institution and thus bears responsibility for the budget. The Business Officer is concerned with all business services, which includes the preparation, adoption, and execution of the budget. Every staff member from President to custodian is, or should be, involved to some extent in the preparation.

The budget in many institutions is a closely guarded secret. The public and the staff are given only the minimum details required by law. The budget is a public document. The quality of the final product increases in direct proportion to the number of individuals involved in the preparation phase. It can be compared to Newton's Law of Motion, i.e., for every action there is an equal and opposite reaction. For every bit of involvement and effort expended in the preparation phase, a dividend will be received. "Too many cooks do not spoil the broth", assuming there is a competent Business Officer acting in a coordinating role.

In discussing the roles of Administrators in building the budget, we should define what a budget is. Tenner and Lynn in their book Municipal and Governmental Accounting state that "Budgeting may be described as the process of allocating scarce resources to unlimited demands". The National Committee on Governmental Accounting, in their publication Municipal Accounting and Auditing, state that "A budget is a plan of operation expressed in dollars and cents. It should include the proposed expenditures for a specified period or purpose and the proposed means of financing same". The budget for any year should attempt to express in financial terms the educational objectives of the institution.

The budget is an attempt to express educational objectives to the extent that these objectives can be financed. The Business Officer is not responsible for educational objectives. This is a responsibility of the Governing Board, the President, the academic administration, and the faculty.

There are two basic methods of budget preparation. The first method, which is used more frequently than the second, consists of reviewing available revenues for the fiscal year. Those concerned with budget preparation are then notified of the availability of funds and expenditures are estimated with the available revenue in mind. The second method consists of converting the educational objectives into expenditures without reference to available revenue. This method, although entailing more work, forces the institution to examine its educational objectives. It is a process of "allocating scarce resources to unlimited demands". These "unlimited demands" are then trimmed to match the available revenues. This method requires a great deal of time because the budget must be revised many times before it is completed. As a further complication, the Business Officer is not qualified to make the decisions in reducing the educational

objectives to fit the available revenue. He is qualified to make recommendations in this area, but the final priorities must be established by academic administrators.

The budgeting process consists of three major divisions. They are as follows:

1. Preparation
2. Adoption
3. Execution

Every staff member should be included in the preparation phase. Usually only the President, Business Officer, and Governing Board are included in the adoption phase. The final phase, execution, concerns all administration, the faculty, and service department heads. In short, it concerns those staff members who have the authority to spend institutional funds.

As previously stated, the preparation phase involves a greater amount of work and involvement than any other phase. The first step in preparation is to determine the estimated enrollment. This usually is a function of the President, Deans of academic faculties, the Business Officer, and the Admissions Officer. This first step is the key to the entire process of budget building. An error in judgment, either in overestimating or underestimating enrollment, can be disastrous. For example, an overestimation of 5 per cent in a community college of an approximate 2,000 enrollment can result in a loss of revenue to fund budgeted expenditures from $100 - 200,000.00. This decision usually involves projections by the Admissions Officer which are reviewed by the other administrators previously named. The enrollment estimated by this committee does much to set the level of expenditures of the institution.

The second step in the process is for the President to draft a cover letter for budget instruction to all department heads responsible for budget building. This letter lists the budget calendar, what are the various deadlines, and the estimated number of students to be cared for in the budget year. It also indicates his general opinion regarding the level of expenditures and his attitude towards improved services.

The Business Office staff prepares departmental budget forms to accompany the President's letter. These forms list the following:

1. The amount expended by account during the previous year.
2. The amount spent to date in the current year.
3. A space for the amount requested by the department for the subsequent year.
4. A space for the amount given preliminary approval.

These forms request a justification for any increased or decreased expenditure and a priority listing with justification for capital outlay items.

The department heads then discuss the proposed budget with their respective staffs. Each staff member, whether an instructor, clerk or custodian, should be given the opportunity to discuss their needs and desires. The department heads then summarize the requests on the forms provided and discuss the request with the division chairman. The division chairman bears a great responsibility in budget preparation. He must understand his staff and their requests. The division chairman may have department chairmen who pad requests, or conversely,

are too frugal in their requests. He must recognize any excesses or deficiencies and correct them so that he is able to defend and justify the divisional requests that he must present to the Budget Committee, the next step in the budgeting procedure.

The Budget Committee's composition varies at different institutions according to the organization chart. Also, the size of the committee varies within the institution. Usually, the academic division budgets are reviewed by a committee consisting of the Vice-President, the Dean of Instruction, and the Business Officer. Many compromises must be reached by this Committee. The Dean is usually concerned with educational philosophy while the Business Officer is concerned with business decisions. Each member of the Committee must be able to compromise his opinions. Service department budgets are usually reviewed by the Vice-President, Business Officer, and the chief administrator responsible for the department under review. The President may be inclined to participate in budget review of those departments whose budgets may be controversial. For example, the President may be involved in the initial review of intercollegiate athletics.

At the culmination of this stage, the budget, in its raw form, should be educationally sound and defensible, although perhaps not financially feasible. Following the budget conferences, a sizeable period of time elapses. It is during this time that the Business Officer, or Budget Officer, summarizes each departmental budget complete with justification of line item expenditures and reviews the revenue available to fund the expenditures.

When this task is completed, a budget review with the President is in order. The President reviews expenditures for educational objectives and double checks the revenue projected by the Business Officer. A complete revision may have to be made at this time because revenues usually will not accommodate the expenditures budgeted. Additional revenues should be examined at this point if the expenditures cannot be financed assuming the President is confident that the level of expenditures are completely justifiable. Student fees may need to be increased, or a mill levy, if one is available, may also need to be raised. If additional revenues are not available, the only alternative is to reduce expenditures.

If the budget cannot be financed, the President should refer the budget back to the Budget Committee with instructions as to how much should be cut from the budget and with recommendations as to how the budget cuts might be attained. The Budget Committee may recall division heads to discuss possible cuts, or they may be able to weigh priorities within the Committee and be able to refer a balanced budget back to the President.

At this point it should be noted that various committees may have been working parallel with the Budget Committee or may have been working prior to the time that preparation began. Specific examples of this would be a Faculty Salary Committee to determine salaries, or an Athletic Committee to determine the price of admissions to intercollegiate athletic events.

The balanced budget should again be referred to the President for final review. When all problems have been resolved the budget document is ready to be printed. At this point, the educational objectives have been budgeted to the extent that the resources of the institution can finance them. The President and staff may not be satisfied that the objectives have been provided for, but they must be satisfied that they are budgeted to the extent financially possible.

The final step in preparation is the submission of the budget by the President to the Governing Board for review. The Governing Board may accept the budget, or they may revise it, or they may refer it back to the President for further revision. Once the Board has accepted the budget, the preparation phase has been completed. Each division chairman, or department head should receive an approved copy of the budget from the Business Office.

The adoption phase is not a detailed procedure, but usually involves some legal requirements such as advertising for public inspection and filing of the budget with various state offices. The execution phase consumes the entire budget year. Each department is aware of what funds are available to them for spending. The Business Office should assist them in their spending through the use of accepted business procedures and through the issuance of monthly reports advising them of the status of the departmental budget.

In summation, the preparation phase is the most important phase. If a budget is to be generally understood and accepted, the total staff must be involved in the preparation.

DEVELOPING LEADERSHIP IN THE COLLEGE AND THE COMMUNITY

William L. Mc Divitt, President
Otero Junior College
La Junta, Colorado

I have been asked to talk to you today about leadership. Much of what I have to say at the outset will be rather general. I will then get into some specifics, and give you an opportunity to ask questions. Frankly, I feel that the best leadership methods are yet to be discovered. I think we are only in the feeble beginnings of developing leadership. Too much administration today is more a matter of playing the role of mediator or arbitrator than a matter of exercising genuine leadership. This is one of the big problems. Administrative leadership is more than a set of procedures; you must feel it. You must know that you can command an audience and make the thing happen that you wish to have happen.

I think that many people in a position of leadership today are afraid of being found out. They are afraid of getting a little bit involved emotionally. Many follow rather astute academic procedures, but follow them almost to the extent of nullifying emotional involvement. Those who should be leading are, I feel, often overly timid and self-protective.

Let's take a look for a moment at what the background of a leader must be. An active life must be a challenge to a leader. He has to be able to bound out of bed in the morning, feeling like there are a great many things that have to be done, and relishing every moment of it. If he is overcome by a negative attitude, he is not long for the world from the standpoint of developing leadership ability. He must have positive purpose and objectives in his life. How are enthusiasm and insecurity related? I think a leader must radiate enthusiasm. Further, he must be able to thrive on the feelings of insecurity that often accompany his role. I recommend the book, The Wisdom of Insecurity, to all of you for casual reading; for a lot of us feel insecure in our jobs for we know we don't know all the answers. However, a certain amount of wisdom should come out of this insecurity, or unsureness, which can lead us to a search for alternatives.

A leader must certainly not be afraid of the unknown. Yet, I think many are. One of the unknowns for college administrators is the best way to work with student demands for change. I attended a meeting recently at which John Holloway, the attorney for the University of Colorado, pointed out that college presidents cannot afford to be timid in the presence of student unrest. A lot of"leaders" seem to wish that the problem would simply go away. It won't, so we must be able to organize and lead the house that may seem to be falling about us.

The leader has to be like the man who is partially deaf, who can tune off the clamor while he concentrates on the solution to a problem, and then turn his hearing aid back on and move on from there. There is a time for listening and a time for not listening.

A leader must believe in himself and feel that he is needed in his world. He must believe that out of the chaos of today will come man's challenge and ultimately a better society. Yet a lot of us look at the chaos about us as a subject for coffee conversation, and this is as far as we go. If we don't talk about solutions and make some efforts to organize them to get something done, we stay behind the eightball.

A leader must like all kinds of people. In fact, however, too many people in positions of leadership do not like people. They don't like a lot of their associates. They aren't willing to accept a lot of the "elbow rubbing" they have to do.

We had better learn to accept the people with whom we work daily, and those with whom we have casual contact. The leader must let his associates learn that he does care about them and their problems. Many administrators tower over people and this is a mistake. You cannot hide under the excuse of the size of the institution by simply saying: "Well, we're just too big for me to learn to know the people with whom I work." No institution is that big. Obviously, a man who is president of a large university may not be able to know each one of the students and faculty at first hand. However, he can make himself a friendly creature; a genuinely friendly person who is interested in human beings. Those of us in positions of leadership must develop this character trait.

We must realize that one word of commendation is still worth more than the best criticism. I think each of us must constantly look for things to commend in other people. Maybe only two or three good things happen during the course of the year on your campus but they do happen, and an effort should be made to single these things out and see that the proper commendation gets where it belongs.

Certainly a leader in education, an administrator of any kind, must have an understanding of the learning process, and too few of us have this understanding. Most of us who have been involved in education, at one time or another, took a course in psychology of learning. However, it is too easy to forget about such things and start counting the "nuts and bolts" of education, preparing the budget and doing those things that administrators are supposed to do to keep the doors open. We must also keep up on the literature, that is, findings concerning the learning processes. We are finding out more and more about learning. Psychology is growing up. We must spend more time in briefing ourselves on the new research in education. For example, the innovations in media are valueless if they are not utilized properly by educators. Yet what a world of value is there.

I think one of the most important tasks for college presidents, deans of student personnel services, deans of business affairs and other major officers, is trying to know students. We simply do not get involved with our students to the extent that we should. I think that from the standpoint of good, common sense, we are going to have to get back to helping the people in our classrooms realize that we really do care and that we are drawing our money for doing a real service.

What is the atmosphere in the offices on your college campus? Indifferent admissions offices, for example; can be a real problem. New students and parents who come into the admissions office are often intimidated and are in awe of the college setting. It is so easy to turn around and say to them: "I'm busy right now. Come back tomorrow." They may never come back - I have seen it happen. Admissions officers sometimes complain about the way people make application. What we must realize, even though we get sick and tired of answering the same question five thousand times is that to those five thousand individuals, it is a new question. We have to spend more time in our offices making people feel that in spite of the hectic pace we set in this country, human beings still count.

In fact, sensitivity to people is one of the main themes of this talk. Leadership requires giving whatever talent and time you have to other people. The acid test of a good administrator is the one who can, even though he is a very busy man, let the person talking with him feel that this is the most important thing he has to do at this moment. Even if the house is falling around him, the sensitive administrator can be like the man with the hearing aid. He tunes out the outside noise and lets the house fall because he may save a soul for education.

Let us take a look at the community for just a moment. In a rural area the community holds us in some kind of selective awe. We have our critics, but they also defer to us because we are "educated." Now I am a President, and in a small community this is quite a responsibility to carry. One must be careful how he fulfills his obligations in the eyes of the public. This means one has to go at least ninety and sometimes one hundred percent out of the way to establish rapport with the community. In a community where there may be only one president, one director of student personnel, one dean of business affairs, one counselor, etc., all must be sure they can carry the weight of that responsibility well in the eyes of the community. No matter how well we discharge our responsibilities on campus, when it comes to the town we have to learn to know people by first names. We have to be able to talk with them about the things they know and understand best. In addition, we must be able to impress them with our "great wisdom" and knowledge about how a junior college should function. I think that one of the most important things that top leadership in junior colleges can do is to become identified with the community as a part of it and not apart from it. Too many times we build a wall and an ivory tower for security. Get some of the town people to walk through your buildings even if you have to go out and grab them to bring them up on the hill.

Also, I think we have to help the area grow, not just the college. We are always asking for promotion and support for the college, but I think we have to offer service to the Chamber of Commerce and other organizations as well. It may be that you can help bring in small business and industry. If you work with local community groups then these groups will be there when you need them.

Involving the faculty in the leadership process is also a critical area of concern. In this area I feel firmly that you have to delegate responsibility to faculty and do some encouraging of experimentation and confrontation of problems. I note in passing that many times faculty members are very capable and innovative in areas other than their field of specialization as well as in their own fields. One must have confidence in his ability to delegate responsibility. Then he must say: "You will sink or swim based on what you do, not on what I say. I am available as an advisor on these things but you work it into completion." This gets things done that would not get done otherwise.

You must get the faculty to understand - by means of intelligent discourse and independent discovery rather than by negotiation. Unfortunately, there are those faculty members who prefer to sit at one end of the table and negotiate with administrators at the other end. I don't like the name, rank and serial number discrimination. I think that the cause of education is too vital for us to get into great squabbles about whose professional domain this is or who made that suggestion. I think this type of discrimination among domains will be increasingly difficult for us to fight. However, I think that it must be fought. We will gain far more by discourse than we will by negotiation. In the case of negotiation two groups with preconceived ideas sit down at a table to argue an issue. The idea is to go away from the table with a victory. Getting many concessions with as little sacrifice as possible is the goal. Discourse is quite another matter and requires a very sensitive and skillful administrator as a leader. I think that failure to play this role is where we often break down.

One thing I have had to learn is this: I, as a president, must be willing to listen to criticism of my own office from whatever source. I find patient and careful listening is probably the most constructive thing one can do. If you immediately throw up a defense in response to criticism, you have had it. On this business of listening, you should know that sometimes you can listen until he who talks also understands. At the end of a one-sided conversation the man who listens knows everything he already knew plus much of what the other man knows.

I plan, for next year, to have a definite schedule for students to meet with me on an informal basis. Whatever questions they ask, I will try to field. If I can't answer them, then I will have to be honest and tell them so.

Of course, listening to and working with students, faculty, and townspeople takes a great deal of time, and this point leads me to another basic responsibility of administrative leadership. The leader must decide what are the really important matters, and give his time to those matters. Presidents, for example, could spend practically all of their time in off-campus meetings. I traveled 26,000 miles last year, half by flight and the rest of it in one day trips to Denver and back. I was out of town 45 days, including some Saturdays and Sundays. I realize that presidents have to represent the college in many off-campus affairs, but I think we may do too much of it. Unfortunately, most of us are rather

unselective about how we spend our time. I think we are going to have to analyze the demands on our time, take a stand and realize that we must truly put first things first.One of the biggest words in man's vocabulary, and the hardest one to say, is "no".

You must keep the staff well-informed by periodic bulletins and a newsletter on any and all things that are happening on campus. If there are some contemplated changes in vocational education, certainly the English Department should know this, and, of course, the rest of the staff should too. An especially important aspect of information is telling the story of the college with enthusiasm to each new faculty member. The enthusiasm we radiate in the first few days of contact with new personnel will set the scene for the entire year.

Another area with which the community college leader must be concerned, is faculty evaluations. Faculties are scared to death of evaluations and I will wager that there are very few of you here who have a good, sound faculty evaluation program at your school. We are always talking about it. We spill a lot of printer's ink over the way the job should be done, but we do very little about it. The faculty talks a lot about policing their own organization. We should find out what they recommend in regard to evaluation. Get them to talking about it. The time has come as we get more state and federal money involved in junior colleges to do more in the area of evaluation. Let's get busy at it. We'd better determine how we are going to evaluate, for ourselves, before the edict is handed down to us from on high.

In the late twenties and early thirties the Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association published jointly a statement of the four objectives of education in this country. These were development of civic responsibility, economic efficiency, human relationships and self-realization. I think, of these four, the most important is that of human relationships. This is our area of greatest need. Most of our battles are over personalities and minor differences of opinion, the astuteness of one professional area rubbing sparks with another area. I think all the charts, graphs, studies and lectures will not produce results if the human factor falls short. Every staff member is a leader in his own right. We have to realize when we hire teachers we are not just hiring sheep. A group of ambitious, eager, demanding people is always better than a group who roll over and play dead in the presence of administrators only to become a tower of cynical strength when the administrator's back is turned. I would rather have teachers plaguing me with requests, coming up with new ideas, and using a little abrasive action once in a while, than have a group like the "well-adjusted" third grade where the supervisor walks in and everyone becomes very quiet.

It is assumed that an administrator has the knowledge which qualifies him for the job, when he has the degree. However, knowledge alone is not enough. He must bring his best common sense, judgment, a positive attitude, a love of people and a passion to help young people discover themselves,to his job. I think above all else, you and I have to reemphasize this dedication to young people. Every youngster who comes on campus is vital to the institution and the slowest is just as important as the fastest. All are entitled to experience and administrative leadership that cares, is dynamic, and becomes involved.

1968 WORKSHOP IN COMMUNITY COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION

University of Colorado
July 22 -- August 9, 1968

Tuesday, July 23

Introductions

Discussions: "Context of the Workshop";
"Objectives and Activities of the Workshop"

Dr. Calvin M. Frazier, Associate Professor of Educational Administration, University of Colorado. "New Emphases in Administrative and Organizational Thinking."

Wednesday, July 24 - Field trip to Northeastern Junior College, Sterling, Colo.

The host and principal speaker at Northeastern: Mr. Zane Hays, Dean of Faculties.

Dean Hays' topic: "Allocations of Administrative Responsibility and Authority."

Thursday, July 25

Dr. Joseph Malik, Assistant Professor of Higher Education, University of Colorado. "Current Status and Problems of Student Personnel Services."

Friday, July 26

Dr. Duane Anderson, Associate Professor of Higher Education, University of Iowa. "The Extra-Institutional Obligations of the Community College Administrator."

Monday, July 29

Dr. Paul Elsner, Director, Community College Division, Colorado State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education. "The Role of State Boards and the Functions of Their State Officer."

Tuesday, July 30

Further discussion of presentations by Dr. Anderson and Dr. Elsner

Wednesday, July 31

Field trip to the Community College of Denver. The host and principal speaker: Dr. Leland Luchsinger, President, Community College of Denver. Topic: "Problems of Organizing a New Urban Community College."

Thursday, August 1

Mr. Donald Shore, Business Officer, Mesa College, Grand Junction, Colorado. "Roles of Community College Administrators in Building the Budget."

Friday, August 2

Dr. Norman Harris, Professor of Technical Education, University of Michigan. "Quality and Diversity in the Community College."

Monday, August 5

Dr. John W. Bartram, Director, Budget Office, University of Colorado. "Concepts in Program Budgeting."

Tuesday, August 6

Field trip to Otero Junior College, La Junta, Colorado.

The host and principal speaker at Otero: Dr. William McDivitt, President. Topic: "Developing Leadership in the College and the Community."

Wednesday, August 7

Dr. Thomas M. Shay, Associate Professor of Higher Education, University of Colorado. "The Systems Concept as an Analytical Tool."

Thursday, August 8

Further discussion of "The Systems Concept as an Analytical Tool."

Final Examination.

Friday, August 9

Workshop Evaluation.

PARTICIPANTS - 1968 WORKSHOP IN COMMUNITY COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION

Name:	Mr. Gilbert D. Borthick	Position:	Instructor Aims Community College Greeley, Colorado
Name:	Miss Nancy Lee Butler	Position:	Associate Dean of Students Glendale Community College Glendale, Arizona
Name:	Mr. Myron Harms	Position:	Academic Dean Freeman Junior College Freeman, South Dakota
Name:	Mr. Edward J. Liston	Position:	President Housatonic Community College Stratford, Connecticut
Name:	Mr. James H. Sampson	Position:	Assistant to the President Metropolitan Junior College Kansas City, Missouri
Name:	Mr. L.H. Schroeder	Position:	Dean of Students St. John's College Winfield, Kansas
Name:	Mr. Rus Slicker	Position:	Teaching Associate School of Business University of Colorado Boulder, Colorado
Name:	Mr. Leo Steinberg	Position:	Chairman, Biology Department James Madison High School Brooklyn, New York
Name:	Mr. Keith Victor Robin	Position:	Director of Continuing Education Lethbridge Junior College Lethbridge, Alberta, Canada
Name:	Mr. Sidney Rock	Position:	Chairman, Technical Department Aviation High School Long Island, New York

Name:	Mr. Maurice Tinsley	Position:	Science Teacher Jefferson County Schools Arvada, Colorado
Name:	Mr. Joseph Travaglini	Position:	Assistant to the President Essex Community College Baltimore County, Maryland
Name:	Mr. Jess Waggoner	Position:	Director Civil Defense Training Extension Division University of Colorado Boulder, Colorado